Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
MAR 8 1976
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

No. 75-1269

October Term, 1975

ANTHONY J. CALI,

Petitioner.

v.

JAPAN AIRLINES CO., LTD., SCANDINAVIAN AIRLINES SYSTEMS, SCANDINAVIAN AIRLINES SYSTEM, INC. and KLM ROYAL DUTCH AIRLINES,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

PAUL H. BLAUSTEIN
HOPGOOD, CALIMAFDE, KALIL,
BLAUSTEIN & LIEBERMAN
Attorneys for Petitioner
60 East 42nd St.
New York, N.Y. 10017
(212) 986-2480

Dick Bailey Printers • P.O. Box X, Staten Island, N.Y. 10302 • Tel.: (212) 447-5358

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Opinions Below 1

Jurisdiction 2

Questions Presented 2

The Treaties and Statutes Involved 2

The Nature of the Case 4

Reasons for Granting the Petition 5

Conclusion 12

APPENDICES

Memorandum and Order of District Court
dated Aug. 20, 1974 ..... 1a

Memorandum and Order of District Court
dated November 6, 1974 ..... 20a

Judgment of District Court
(SAS and SAS, Inc. and KLM) 22a

Judgment of District Court
(JAL) 23a

Order of the United States
Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit 24a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Anderson's-Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co., 396 U.S. 57, 61 (1969) 6

Belknap v. Schild, 60 U.S. 183 (1856) 9

Brown v. Duchesne, 60 U.S. 183 :1856) 5

Cammeyer v. Newton, 94 U.S. 226, 234 (1876) 8

Cramp & Sons v. Curtis Turbine Co., 246 U.S. 28, 40 :1918; 8

Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1 :1966) 6

Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. v. Supermarket Equipment Corp., 340 U.S. 147, 154 (1950) 5

James v. Campbell, 104 U.S. 356 (1881) 10

Radio Position Finding Corporation v. Bendix, 205 F.Supp. 850 (D.Md. 1962), aff'd 371 U.S. 577 (1963) 11

Richmond Screw Anchor Co. v. U.S., 275 U.S. 331, 342-3 (1928) 11

Twentieth Century Music Corporation v. George Aiken, ——U.S.——, 47 L.Ed.2d 84, 186 U.S.P.Q. 65 (1975) 11

U.S. v. Palmer, 128 U.S. 262, 270-271 (1898) 10

STATUTES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES

35 U.S.C. §272 4

§1254 of Title 28 of the United States Code 2

Chicago Convention, Article 27 2

Paris Convention, Article 5ter, Par. 2 3

United States Constitution, Article 1, Sec. 8, Cl 8 5

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

ANTHONY J. CALI,
Petitioner,

v.

JAPAN AIRLINES CO., LTD., SCANDINAVIAN AIRLINES SYSTEMS, SCANDINAVIAN AIRLINES SYSTEM, INC. and KLM ROYAL DUTCH AIRLINES,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Petitioner, Anthony J. Cali (Cali) respectfully prays that a Writ of Certiorari be granted to review the Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit entered in this cause on December 8, 1975 (24a).

OPINIONS BELOW

The Order of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (22a, 23a) entered February 5, 1975 dismissing the complaint was based upon an opinion reported at 380 F.Supp. 1120, and printed herein at 1a.

This opinion upheld the constitutionality of Article 27 of the Chicago Convention which granted immunity to foreign airlines from patent infringement in the United States, as well as construing 35 U.S.C. 272 and Article 5ter of the Paris Convention in a way to constitutionally sustain the immunity of foreign airlines. The Court of Appeals of the Second Circuit affirmed, per curiam, in an unreported order on December 8, 1975 (24a).

JURISDICTION

The Court's jurisdiction is invoked under §1254 of Title 28 of the United States Code. This petition is filed within 90 days of the Judgment of the Court of Appeals.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Does the Patent Clause, Article I, Sec. 8, cl 8, which requires the securing to the inventor of the exclusive Right to his invention, make "exclusivity" a Constitutional standard of grant, except where just compensation is provided?

> "The Congress shall have Power . . . To promote The Progress of Science and Useful Arts by *securing* for limited times to Authors and Inventors the *exclusive right* to their respective Writings and Discoveries."

2. Does Congress have the constitutional power under the Patent Clause to grant, by treaty or statute, to foreign air carriers who have substantial permanent domestic presence, a royalty free license for "large" domestic uses of a patented invention, without violating the constitutional standard of grant?

THE TREATIES AND STATUTES INVOLVED

Article 27 of the Chicago Convention

(a) While engaged in international air navigation, any authorized entry of aircraft of a contracting State into the territory of another contracting State or authorized transit across the territory of such State with or without landings shall not entail any seizure or detention of the aircraft or any claim against the owner or operator thereof or any other interference therewith by or on

behalf of such State or any person therein, on the ground that the construction, mechanism, parts, accessories or operation of the aircraft is an infringement of any patent, design, or model duly granted or registered in the State whose territory is entered by the aircraft, it being agreed that no deposit of security in connection with the foregoing exemption from seizure or detention of the aircraft shall in any case be required in the State entered by such aircraft.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (a) of this Article shall also be applicable to the storage of spare parts and spare equipment for the aircraft and the right to use and install the same in the repair of an aircraft of a contracting State in the territory of any other contracting State, provided that any patented part or equipment so stored shall not be sold or distributed internally in or exported commercially from the contracting State entered by the aircraft.

(c) The benefits of this Article shall apply only to such States, parties to this Convention, as either (1) are parties to the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property and to any amendments thereof; or (2) have enacted patent laws which recognize and give adequate protection to interventions made by the nationals of the other States parties to this Convention.

Article 5 *ter*

In each of the contracting countries the following shall not be considered as infringements of the rights of a patentee:

1. the use on board vessels of other countries of the Union of devices forming the subject of his patent in the body of the vessel, in the machinery, tackle, gear and other accessories, which such vessels temporarily or accidentally enter the waters of a country, provided that such devices are used there exclusively for the needs of the vessel;

2. the use of devices forming the subject of the patent in the construction or operation of aircraft or land vehicles of other countries of the Union, or of accessories to such aircraft or land vehicles, when those aircraft or land vehicles temporarily or accidentally enter the country.

35 U.S.C. §272

§272. Temporary presence in the United States

The use of any invention in any vessel, aircraft or vehicle of any country which affords similar privileges to vessels, aircraft or vehicles of the United States, entering the United States temporarily or accidentally, shall not constitute infringement of any patent, if the invention is used exclusively for the needs of the vessel, aircraft or vehicle and is not sold in or used for the manufacture of anything to be sold in or exported from the United States.

THE NATURE OF THE CASE

This action was brought by Cali, an individual inventor, against three major foreign airlines, Japan Airlines Co., Ltd. (JAL), KLM Royal Dutch Airlines (KLM), Scandinavian Airlines System (SAS) and Scandinavian Airlines System, Inc. There is no dispute that the subject matter of the patent, although made outside of the United States, was used on engines of these airlines in regularly scheduled flights to and from the United States. The usual issues of validity and infringement were not before the lower courts.

A threshold issue relating to the constitutionality of the immunity defense based upon treaty and statute was resolved without trial by pretrial motions to dismiss. The immunity was based on Article 27 of the Chicago Convention in 1945, a broad treaty which extinguished

claims of infringement against aircraft of a foreign state and 35 U.S.C. §272; and, the similarly worded Paris Convention, Article 5ter par. 2, which declared that the temporary presence of aircraft of a foreign country was not an infringing use.

Judge Dooling's opinion (1a) went to the merits of the defense. He upheld the validity and constitutionality of the treaties and statute and gave a broad scope to these defenses. The threshold issue was decided against Cali and became dispositive of the case and judgment was entered dismissing the complaint (22a, 23a). The Court of Appeals affirmed.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The lower court decisions are inconsistent with prior decisions of this Court which grant to the inventor who obtains a patent the exclusive right of his invention unless there is just compensation when a compulsory license is required. Here, a royalty free license has been legislated and decreed as an exemption.

The scope of exemption from acts of patent infringement accorded to international carriers has been the subject of one prior case of this Court, *Brown v. Duchesne*, 60 U.S. (19 How) 183 (1957). The holding of *Brown v. Duchesne* was codified in 35 U.S.C. 272. While *Brown v. Duchesne* and the statute 35 U.S.C. 272 reflect the limitations imposed by the United States Constitution, Article 1, Sec. 8, cl 8 in granting patent immunity, such concern is completely absent in the Chicago Convention which extinguishes any possible right to a claim of patent infringement by a United States national with respect to international airlines.

If the breadth of Article 27 of the Chicago convention is

constitutionally valid, it bars Cali's claim against defendant foreign airlines. The lower court found as a fact that the uses of defendants were "large" and a "very great subtraction" (17a) and were not insubstantial as was the case in *Brown v. Duchesne.*

We submit this Petition should be granted because the United States Constitution, Article I, Sec. 8, Cl 8, requires Congress to secure exclusive rights to inventors. Royalty free licenses may not be reserved, even for the United States government.

The lower court recognized that this Court in *Brown,* differentiated between a profitable use of a patent by making and selling as opposed to "the trifling use of the gaff improvement" and he recognized that the Supreme Court "saw no real damage sustained by the plaintiff."

The "trifling" damage aspect, we submit, was a prerequisite of the *Brown* rationale, which distinguishes it from the "great subtraction" of the patentee's rights which is presented here. Congress does not have the authority to divest a large part of the inventor's rights to the exclusive use of his invention, which we contend derives from a Constitutional standard.

We submit that there is a Constitutional standard of exclusivity as to the scope of a patent grant, as well as a Constitutional standard as to the prerequisite of a grant.

In *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966), the Court noted that the standard of validity requires references to a "standard written into the Constitution", citing *A&P Tea Co. v. Supermarket Corp.*, 340 U.S. 147, 154 (1950). See also, *Anderson's-Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co.*, 396 U.S. 57, 61 (1969), where this Court said that the "patent standard is basically constitutional" and which also summarizes the settled

limitation on Congressional power. This is based on Article I, Sec. 8, Cl 8, which clause is "both a grant of power and a limitation" *Graham, supra,* 383 U.S. at 5. Congress must meet a Constitutional standard of i vention because the Constitution requires that "Progress" and only "Inventors" may be given the "exclusive Rights". Congress must give weight to these words. Congress does not have complete free rein, although it may set out the conditions and tests for patentability which comport with "Constitutional strictures", *Graham, supra,* 383 U.S. at 17.

The standard of grant is even more clearly spelled out by the word "exclusive". Congress, we submit, lacks the power to grant a non-exclusive exception to the United States government, a foreign government, or the foreign airlines. The patent statute is derived from a standard: "it may not be ignored." *Graham, supra,* 383 U.S. at 6.

An even-handed application of the Constitution requires a reference to a Constitutional standard both as to the inventor's contribution (in meeting the high standard of patentability) and as to his reward (the "exclusive Right"). The standard of reward must be interpreted in the light of a Constitutionally mandated exclusive right. As stated in *A&P, supra,* at 340 U.S. at 154:

> "The purpose is 'To Promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts.' The means for achievement of the end is the grant for a legitimate time to inventors of the exclusive right to their invention."

The Constitution states that Congress has the power of "securing" to "Inventors" the "exclusive Right". And, if the inventor meets the conditions of patentability, the Constitution intends and expressly states that exclusive rights should be secured.

Therefore, we submit that a Constitutional standard of grant exists which applied to a standard of patentability, applies as well as a standard of grant.

A further reason for granting this petition is because the Courts below failed to give proper weight to prior decisions of this Court which have held that Congress cannot grant less than exclusive rights and reserve to the U.S. or others non-exclusive rights based on the patent power or any other power.

Under the Patent Clause, therefore, Congress cannot grant any royalty free license to the United States government. In *Cammeyer v. Newton*, 94 U.S. 226, 234 (1876), this Court said:

> "Conclusive support to that porposition is found in a recent decision of this court, in which it is held that the government cannot, after the patent is issued, make use of the improvement any more than a private individual, without license of the inventor or making compensation."

These rights are guaranteed by the Patent clause of the Constitution. *Cramp & Sons v. Curtis Turbine Co.*, 246 U.S. 28, 40 (1918); *Hollister v. Benedict Manufacturing Co.*, 113 U.S. 59, 67 (1884).*

If the Patent clause requires the securing of exclusive rights as a Constitutional standard, the question may then be asked whether any other Constitutional power justifies a

---

*The issue should be determined by the power of Congress based upon the Patent Clause. As was said in *Brown* (60 U.S. at 194):

"The question depends on the construction of the patent laws."

The patent right which is to be accorded by the Constitution, cannot be limited by treaty.

As said in *Brown* (60 U.S. at 197):

"And it will be remembered that the demand, if well founded in the patent laws could not be controlled or put aside by treaty."

royalty free license to a private party.

This is the first case in which any Court has granted, by decree, a royalty free license as being within the Constitution, apart from violations of the antitrust laws, where the use is not minimal and the patentee's property was diminished in value. Congress is, thus, given the authority to grant what amounts to royalty free licenses for large or even great uses; that is, large in the sense of a large subtraction of a patentee's right.

The Court below gave a pre-eminent position to the power of Congress to conduct foreign trade by treaty. However, Congressional sources of power deal with other national priorities which are even more important than foreign trade. In such cases, the right to decree royalty free licenses to the United States government has been denied.

We contend that what Congress could not grant to the United States government (in terms of royalty free licenses), it could not grant to a private party. That is, if Congress could not confer a royalty free license to the United States government (either for the purpose of conducting national defense or international trade), it could not confer to JAL, KLM, or SAS, for that matter, Pan Am or TWA.

In *Belknap v. Schild*, 161 U.S. 10, 15 (1895), this Court said:

> "In England, the grant of a patent for an invention is considered as simply an exercise of the royal prerogative, and not to be construed as precluding the Crown from using the invention as its pleasure; and therefore a petition of right cannot be maintained against the Crown for using a patented invention; although a private person or corporation, that has contracted to supply the government with articles embodying the invention, may be sued for infringement of the patent. (Citations omitted.)

"But, in this country, letters patent for inventions are not granted *in the exercise of perogative, or as a matter of favor*, but under Art. 1, Sec. 8, of the Constitution of the United States, which gives Congress power 'to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited terms to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries. Rev. Stat. §4884. *And this Court has repeatedly and uniformly declared that the United States have no more right than any private* person to use a patented invention without license of the patentee or *making compensation to him.*" (Emphasis ours.)

See also *U.S. v. Palmer*, 128 U.S. 262, 270-271 (1898) and *Hollister v. Benedict Manufacturing Co.*, 113 U.S. 67 (1888).

In national defense cases, where a similar issue arose before, this Court has held that a patentee's rights is exclusive and that Congress does not have the power or the right to give a royalty free license. Congress does not act like the English crown. See *James v. Campbell*, 104 U.S. 356, 358 (1881).

This Court has recognized the Constitutional character of a patentee's involving the public and national need to obtain military equipment even during war. We submit this was of equal or of greater importance than the public interest in promoting international air navigation. In *Cramp & Sons v. Curtis Turbine Co.*, 246 U.S. 28 (1918), this Court held that private contractors producing equipment for wartime purposes (two torpedo boat destroyers in the middle of World War) were not in any way immune from suit.

This decision did not produce national chaos. The matter was simply solved by a Congressional amendment which essentially extended the right of eminent domain to

private contractors performing work for the government and provided for just compensation to the patentee. See *Richmond Screw Anchor Co. v. U.S.*, 275 U.S. 331, 342-3 (1928), where the Supreme Court referred to testimony by the Acting Secretary of the Navy that *Cramp* case restricted "vital activities" of the Navy and posed "severe consequences" and promised "serious disadvantages of the public interest".

It is thus clear that the patentee's right of property is sufficiently strong, and giving due regard to Congressional military powers with respect to the declaration of war, appropriation of funds for war, and the President's power to conduct warfare as Commander-In-Chief, to be fully recognized by this Court during wartime. This Court has never accepted an argument of immunity for a claim of patent infringement, even on the part of the United States government or for the purpose of national defense in circumstances of war.

Defendants have relied on *Radio Position Finding Corporation v. Bendix*, 205 F.Supp. 850 (D. Md. 1962), aff'd. 371 U.S. 577 (1963). However, this case is addressed to the determination of the scope of rights granted to an extension patent monopoly under a private law, after the original patent expires and *where just compensation by royalty is provided. Radio Position* leaves the issue presented here open.

They further rely on a recent decision, *Twentieth Century Music Corporation v. George Aiken*, —— U.S. ——, 45 L.Ed.2d 84, 186 U.S.P.Q. 65 :1975; wherein this Court held that the use of a broadcast in an entertainment and business establishment was not an infringement since it was not a performance. Copyright cases involve a performer and a viewer. A viewer is a passive beneficiary.

The copyright owner receives his tribute from the performer. Having licensed and received revenue, the copyright owner cannot complain about lack of exclusivity or lack of just compensation. No royalty free license was there legislated, as is the case here. The copyright owner thus receives a "fair return" or just compensation as a royalty based on the original performance.

CONCLUSION

We submit that this Petition should be granted to resolve the underlying question as to whether the patent clause of the Constitution precludes Congress from legislating royalty free patent licenses.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL H. BLAUSTEIN
HOPGOOD, CALIMAFDE, KALIL,
BLAUSTEIN & LIEBERMAN
Attorneys for Petitioner

APPENDICES

Anthony J. CALI, Plaintiff,

v.

**JAPAN AIRLINES, INC., et al.,
Defendants.**

No. 73 C 1596

United States District Court,
E. D. New York.
Aug. 20, 1974.

Suit charging international air carriers, which were air carriers of their respective national states, with infringing United States patent relating to modification introduced into JT-4 jet engines. Plaintiff moved for summary judgment in substance striking defenses based on patent statute and on Article 5ter of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of 1958 and Article 27 of the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation of 1944, to both of which conventions the respective national states were parties. The District Court, Dooling, J., held that constitutional provision empowering Congress to issue patents is not self-executing, that patent law must not be interpreted to abridge the nation's capacity to carry on its treaty-making powers and its power to regulate foreign commerce, that substantiality in subtractions of use from exclusiveness of grant of a patent is within the treaty-making power, that defendant's use for the modified JT-4 jet engine in regular transoceanic passenger and freight service to and from the United States fell within the

protection from infringement afforded by statute and Conventions, notwithstanding use of words "temporary" and "accidental" in statute and the Paris Convention.

Motion denied.

1. Patents 3

Constitutional provision empowering Congress to promote progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to inventors the exclusive right to their respective discoveries is not self-executing; it empowers but does not command Congress to grant patent rights; source of any specific patent right is the statute which defines the nature and extent of the patent right granted. U.S.C.A. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 8; 35 U.S.C.A. §§ 101, 154.

2. Commerce 1
Patents 2
Treaties 2

Power to regulate commerce and the treaty-making powers are separate and distinct powers of the general government and are not connected with the power, domestic in its character, to promote the progress of science by securing to inventors for a limited time the exclusive right to their discoveries. U.S.C.A. Const. art. 1, § 8, cl. 8; 35 U.S.C.A. §§ 101, 154.

3. Patents 189

Patent laws are not intended to have extraterritorial operation. U.S.C. A. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 8; 35 U.S.C.A. §§ 101, 154.

4. Commerce 53
Patents 3
Treaties 2

Patent law must not be so interpreted as to impair the treaty-making capacity of the nation or to clog its power to regulate foreign commerce since that would make patent grants a surrender pro tanto of sovereignty to private persons. U.S.C.A. Const. art. 1, § 8, cl. 8; 35 U.S.C.A. §§ 101, 154.

5. Patents 181

Unless the language of the patent statute plainly compels it, the statute must not be taken to grant rights in terms so broad that existing or later treaties must necessarily constitute a "taking" of some part of the patentee's grant. U.S.C.A. Const. art. 1, § 8, cl. 8; 35 U.S.C.A. §§ 101, 154.

6 Patents 260

Word "temporarily" within statute providing that use of any invention in an aircraft entering the United States temporarily shall not constitute patent infringement and comparable provisions of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of 1958 does not mean any less than entrance for the purpose of completing a voyage, turning about, and continuing or commencing a new voyage. 35 U.S.C.A. § 272.

See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

7. Patents 328(2)

Patent No. 3,265,290, which relates to modification introduced into JT-4 jet engines, was not infringed by

regular use of patented engine in air service to the United States by transoceanic commercial air carriers, which were air carriers of their national states; use of engines in regular international service to the United States did not put carriers outside scope of protection from infringement claims afforded by Article 5ter of the Paris Convention for the protection of Industrial Property of 1958, Article 27 of the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation of 1944 or patent statute governing temporary presence in United States of foreign aircraft using patented inventions. U.S.C.A. Const. art. 1, § 8, cl. 8; 35 U.S.C.A. §§ 101, 154, 272.

8. Patents 189

Substantiality in the subtraction of use from the exclusiveness of the grant of a patent governing an invention applicable to an aircraft is within the treaty-making power; such substantial subtraction falls within scope of the Paris Convention for Protection of Industrial Property of 1958, the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation of 1944 and similar patent statute, notwithstanding use of word such as "temporary" and "accidental" when referring to entry into the United States; also, such subtraction is not limited to patent rights that are without commercial significance. U.S.C.A. Const. art. 1, § 8, cl. 8; 35 U.S.C.A. §§ 101, 154, 272.

9. United States 97

Once the United States has granted a patent under existing patent law, it is itself required to pay tribute to the patentee if it uses the patent; however, the government can take, by condemnation, a license under the patent if required for a public use. U.S.C.A. Const. art. 1, § 8, cl. 8; 35 U.S.C.A. §§ 101, 154.

10. Patents 258

Implicit in grant of a patent is the right to limit infringement claims in connection with use of an invention in foreign commerce; provisions of international conventions and treaties limiting infringement claims as regards the use of an invention in vehicles of foreign commerce are integral limitations on grant of a patent for such inventions. U.S.C.A. Const. art. 1, § 8, cl. 8; 35 U.S.C.A. §§ 101, 154, 272.

* * *

Paul H. Blaustein, New York City (Sandoe, Hopgood & Calimafde, New York City, of counsel), for plaintiff.

Donald E. Degling, New York City (Fish & Neave and James M. Estabrook, Jr., New York City, of counsel), for defendants Japan Airlines Co. Ltd., and KLM Royal Dutch Airlines.

Louis H. Kurrelmeyer, New York City (Hale Russell & Stentzel, Alan D. Sugarman, New York City, of counsel), for defendants Scandinavian Airlines System and Scandinavian System, Inc.

MEMORANDUM and ORDER

DOOLING, District Judge.

The claims of the Cali patent (No. 3,265,290) relate to a modification introduced into JT-4 jet engines in which the seventh stage vane and shroud assembly of the low pressure compressor is affixed to the fairing by welding or by tie-rods. The plaintiff alleges that the defendant international air carriers have infringed the patent by using JT—4 engines so modified in their flights to and from the United States and their overflights of the United States in the course of the regular prosecution of their scheduled air services to this country. It is not claimed that any defendants either made or sold any engines covered by the claims of the patent in the United States. It is claimed that they have regularly used the patent within this country in their regular air services to this country. Plaintiff points out, and it is undeniable, that all three defendants are major transoceanic carriers and that their passenger and freight services to the United States and over the United States are regular, of very considerable extent, long continued, and supported by ground service, marketing facilities, etc. Defendants' uses of the engines have been exclusively for the flight needs of their aircraft, and all three defendant carriers are foreign carriers and are subject to the restrictions of law applicable in this country to foreign carriers. All three are authorized by the CAB to conduct the air services to and from the United States which they are conducting and, in that sense, the entries of their aircraft into the United States are authorized entries. The defendant aircraft are "aircraft of other countries," and are "aircraft of" their respective national states.

The defendants contend (without conceding that the

patent is valid or has been infringed) that, even if the patent is valid and the engines used in certain of their aircraft would be infringing engines if made or sold or used in the United States, their use of the invention of the patent in their aircraft does not constitute infringement of the patent because of the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 272 and the provisions of Article 5ter of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of 1958, which came into force for the United States on January 4, 1962, and of Article 27 of the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation of 1944, which came into force for the United States April 4, 1947, to both of which conventions the United States, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Japan and The Netherlands became and are parties.

Section 272 of the patent law first appeared in the codification of July 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 812). So far as relevant it provides:

> "The use of any invention in any . . . aircraft . . . of any country which affords similar privileges to . . . aircraft . . . of the United States, entering the United States temporarily or accidentally, shall not constitute infringement of any patent, if the invention is used exclusively for the needs of the . . . aircraft . . . and is not sold in or used for the manufacture of anything to be sold in or exported from the United States."

Article 5ter of the Paris Convention is very similar in language. It provides:

> "In each of the countries of the Union the following shall not be considered as infringement of the rights of a patentee:
>
> * * *
>
> 2. The use of devices forming the subject of the

patent in the construction or operation of aircraft . . . of other countries of the Union, or of accessories to such aircraft . . . when those aircraft . . . temporarily or accidentally enter the country."

The Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation, at least in form, seems much more inclusive in defining the exempted uses, although its language presents some difficulty. It provides in Article 27:

> "(a) While engaged in international air navigation, any authorized entry of aircraft of a contracting State into the territory of another contracting State or authorized transit across the territory of such State with or without landing shall not entail . . . any claim against the owner or operator thereof . . . by or on behalf of such State or any person therein, on the ground that the construction, mechanism, parts, accessories or operation of the aircraft is an infringement of any patent . . . duly granted . . . in the State whose territory is entered by the aircraft . . . .
>
> * * *
>
> "(c) The benefits of this Article shall apply only to such States parties to this Convention, as either (1) are parties to the International Convention for the protection of Industrial Property and to any amendments thereof; or (2) have enacted patent laws which recognize and give adequate protection to inventions made by the nationals of the other States parties to this Convention."

The United States, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Japan and The Netherlands are all parties to the Convention referred to and hence Article 27 applies to them.

Plaintiff emphasizes that Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution empowers the Congress "To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to . . . Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective . . . Discoveries"., that 35 U.S.C. § 101 accords the inventor or discoverer of "any new and useful . . . machine . . . or any new and useful improvement thereof" the right to obtain a patent upon it, and that 35 U.S.C. § 154 provides that

> "Every patent shall contain . . . a grant to the patentee . . . for the term of seventeen years, of the right to exclude others from making, using, or selling the invention throughout the United States . . . ."

Plaintiff argues that if an invention is patentable, the Government is constitutionally precluded from according the inventor anything less than the exclusive grant described, in the Constitution and provided for in Section 154. Plaintiff argues that, in consequence, there can be no exception from the patent grant of foreign air carriers' regular and extensive uses of patentable inventions in the United States even if their uses are wholly confined to the needs of international air navigation, since that would make the patent grants non-exclusive, and the Congress has neither the power, constitutionally, so to limit patent grants nor has it done so in Section 154. Article 27 of the Chicago Convention is, therefore, plaintiff argues, invalid since it plainly licenses a very wide area of use, creates a wide rift of non-exclusivity in every patent covering articles incorporated in aircraft and needed in their navigation. Further, Plaintiff argues, Section 272, was first enacted after the Chicago Convention last came into effect and, enacted in far narrower terms, must be considered to have

superseded Article 27 or, if not, at least greatly to have narrowed its field of application; and plaintiff contends, the same must be said of the Paris Convention, most recently amended and reconfirmed in 1962. Finally, Plaintiff argues, Section 272 itself (and Article 5ter of the Paris Convention), which relates only to foreign aircraft "temporarily or accidentally entering" this country, cannot be taken to cover the maintenance of a regular and systematic international aircraft service to the United States, including overflights of it.

It is concluded that the statute, Section 272, and the Paris Convention, Article 5ter, cannot be so narrowly interpreted as plaintiff contends, and that Article 27 of the Chicago Convention, Article 5ter, of the Paris Convention, and Section 272, are constitutionally valid as applied to the defendants' uses of plaintiff's patented engines, and, therefore, accord defendants a complete defense to the claims against them for patent infringement.

[1] The constitutional provision is not self-executing. It empowers but does not command the Congress to grant patent rights, and the source of any specific patent right is the statute which defines the nature and extent of the patent right granted. See Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp., 1972, 406 U.S. 518, 525-526, 92 S.Ct. 1700, 32 L.Ed.2d 273. In Mast, Foos & Co. v. Stover Mfg. Co., 1900, 177 U.S. 485, 494, 20 S. Ct. 708, 712, 44 L.Ed. 856, the court observed sharply.

> "Congress having created the monopoly, may put such limitations upon it as it pleases."

Brown v. Duchesne, 1857, 60 U.S. (19 How.) 183, 15 L.Ed. 595 underlies Section 272. In that case, plaintiff sued defendant for infringing plaintiff's patent on a construction in a gaff for sailing vessels, charging that

defendant had used the gaff improvement at Boston without consent. Defendant pleaded that he used the improvement only in the gaffs of a French schooner of which he was the master, being himself a subject of France, the vessel being one built in France and owned and manned by French subjects, and, at the time of the alleged infringement, upon a lawful journey under the flag of France from a colony of France to Boston and back to the colony, that the voyage was not ended on the date of the alleged infringement and that the gaffs were placed on the schooner at or near the time of her launching by the builder in order to fit her for the sea. The patentee demurred to the defense, and the Court treated the case as presenting the question whether any improvement in the construction or equipment of the foreign vessel on which there was a United States patent could be used by the vessel within the United States "while she is temporarily there for the purpose of commerce, without the consent of the patentee." 60 U S. (19 How.) at 194.

[2, 3] The language of the patent laws, the Court agreed, was clear enough, if read literally, to apply to the use of the gaff improvement involved in the case. However, the Court thought that the power granted to the Congress to pass patent and copyright laws conferred "no power on Congress to regulate commerce, or the vehicles of commerce, which belong to a foreign nation, and occasionally visit our ports in their commercial pursuits." 60 U.S. (19 How.) at 195. The power to regulate commerce and the treaty making power are separate and distinct powers of the general government and not connected with the power "domestic in its character" (*Id.*) to promote the progress of science by securing to inventors for a limited time the exclusive right to their discoveries. The patent laws are not

intended to have extraterritorial operation. The Court differentiated between a profitable use of a patent, as by manufacturing gaffs in Boston and selling them there and the trifling use of the gaff improvement made by the French schooner in simply coming into port and ceasing to use the gaff when the vessel came to dockside. In this the Court saw no "real damage" sustained by the plaintiff, and no advantage gained by the defendant in the schooner's single trip or occasional trips into the United States. Although damage was presumed for purposes of maintaining an action in such cases, the Court noted, the patent laws do not embrace improvements on foreign ships lawfully made in their own country, for so to view the patent law would be to confer on the patentee the power to exact damages where no real damages had been sustained, and where to do so would seriously embarrass the commerce of the country with foreign nations. Further, such a construction, as the patentee called for, "would confer on patentees not only rights of property, but also political power, and enable them to embarrass the treaty-making power in its negotiations with foreign nations, and also to interfere with the legislation of Congress when exercising its constitutional power to regulate commerce." 60 U.S. (19 How.) at 197. The Court noted further that if the law was so interpreted, then the rights of the patentee could not be put aside by any treaty entered into by the United States. *Id.* Brown v. Duchesne rejected the holding of an English case, which had reached a precisely opposite result; the English case was apparently promptly followed by the enactment of a statute, in 1852, providing that future patents should not extend to prevent the use of the invention in any foreign ship or for the navigation of any foreign ship in British ports, if the invention was not used for the manufacture of articles to be vended within or

exported from Britain, provided that the new enactment's benefit should not extend to ships of any foreign state that failed to extend a similar benefit to British ships.

It will be seen that Brown v. Duchesne is to some extent the source of the ideas and language in Section 272, and that, independent of the existence of Section 272, the approach of Brown v. Duchesne to the problem approximated the British statutory solution.

The United States entered into the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property long before Section 272 was enacted in 1952. Article 5ter, in the 1925 and 1934 versions of the Paris Convention, if not in earlier ones, covered both vessels and air and land engines. The 1934 article provided that the use of any article forming the subject matter of a patent in the construction or operation of air or land locomotive engines of the other countries of the Union, or of accessories to these engines, when the latter enter the country temporarily or accidentally, should not be considered as infringing the rights of a patentee in any of the countries of the Union. The revisers note to Section 272 indicates that the Section was intended to follow the "requirement" of the Paris Convention to which the United States was a party, and that it also clarified the holding of the Supreme Court "that use of a patented invention on board a foreign ship does not infringe a patent."

[4, 5] Although the Court might phrase it differently today, Brown v. Duchesne means at minimum that the patent law must not be so interpreted as to impair the treaty-making capacity of the nation or to clog its power to regulate foreign commerce (since that would make patent grants a surrender *pro tanto* of "sovereignty" to private persons, cf. Norman v. Baltimore & O. R. Co., 1935, 294

U.S. 240, 316, 55 S.Ct. 407, 79 L.Ed. 885; Home Building & Loan Ass'n v. Blaisdell, 1934, 290 U.S. 398, 442-444, 54 S.Ct. 231, 78 L.Ed. 413), and that, hence, unless the language of the patent statute plainly compels it, the statute must not be taken to grant rights in terms so broad that existing or later treaties must necessarily constitute a "taking" of some part of the patentee's grant. The Court emphasized the "no damage" aspect in reaching its conclusion, but that does not mean that the Court was holding that only trivial uses could be considered non-infringing uses. The Grant of the patent then, as now, granted the patentee the right to exclude others from making, using, or selling the article of the patent; the Court was dealing with an article made in France, sold in France and used in transoceanic travel and, finally, used to make and leave port on a voyage to the United States. The shipowner's significant uses of the art of the gaff patent were foreign to the United States, although the gaff was presumably indispensable for making and leaving port. Such a use within the United States would not, perhaps, today be characterized as trivial and non-damaging since it was ienvitable and necessary, but it was not in fact different in kind and use-value from a foreign-owned aircraft's use of the Cali patent in one or more of its engines to land, turn about and take off.

In any event, the United States has in substance so interpreted its own patent laws in unhesitatingly becoming a party to the Paris Convention and the Chicago Convention, both of which specifically deal with the very subject matter of Brown v. Duchesne and Section 272, and do so in an historical evolution which furnishes an insight into the meaning of the word "temporarily" as used in the phrase "entering the United States temporarily or accidentally." Counsel have cited a passage from the record

of the proceedings at the Hague Conference indicating that in a committee meeting in connection with the 1925 consideration of Article 5ter, subparagraph 2, the question of the significance of "temporarily" was brought up for discussion; the committee indicated that the words "temporarily" and "accidentally" were chosen to cover entries into port for more or less brief periods whether periodically or exceptionally and whether unintentionally or not.

[6] The enactment of Section 272 and the adoption of Article 5ter would be incomprehensible if they were intended to cover only trivia. Their adoption implies that they were understood to create a useful immunity from infringement liability that was of enough importance to occupy the attention of the Congress and the negotiators of two treaties. Their language was chosen to deal with an internationally significant matter arising in a world in which scheduled freight and passenger services by established international carriers by air and sea were likely to require such an immunity to cover countless articles aboard aircraft or vessels that could turn out to be covered by patents in the United States that were without counterpart abroad. It is difficult to see any other purpose in Section 272 and Article 5ter than to meet the needs and realities of international trade and navigation. "Temporarily," then, could not sensibly mean any less than entering for the purpose of completing a voyage, turning about, and continuing or commencing a new voyage. The distinction would be between a Caravelle, manufactured in France and powered with such an engine, delivered here for use by an airline in this country for domestic traffic, even though manufactured and sold in France, and a foreign aircraft arriving here on an international flight only to unload, turn about, reload and depart.

But if that interpretation of Section 272 and Article 5ter were doubtful, the interpretation of Article 27 of the Chicago Convention is far too clear to debate and it is not, it is understood, claimed that Article 27 of the Chicago Convention is not literally sufficient to accord the defendant airlines a defense if it is valid. It is suggested that it is invalid simply because it is broader than Brown v. Duchesne, Section 272 and Article 5ter which may be taken among them to mark the constitutional limit of what may be subtracted from the grant to the patentee of the right to exclude all others from the use of his patent, and, in the case of the 1958 amendment and repromulgation of the Paris Convention, may be even taken as impliedly reducing the scope of any broader immunity that might be thought to have been granted by Article 27. However, the statute, including Section 272, and the two treaties are not inconsistent one with the other. For example, Article 27 says nothing about accidental entires (which might well not be authorized entries). But even if that were not so, the coexistence of the two treaty provisions is understandable and does not argue an inconsistency. The Paris Convention is not limited to aircraft or vessels or temporary or accidental entries. It covers the whole field of the Protection of Industrial Property "understood in the broadest sense" and it applies "not only to industry and commerce proper, but likewise to agricultural and extractive industries and to all manufactured or natural products" (Article 1 of the Paris Convention). The Chicago Convention is devoted to International Civil Aviation and not to the Protection of Industrial Property Rights; it deals with the facilitation of international aviation and the elimination of blocks and clogs to it. The two subjects intersect at the point where each considers patents used in international navigation by carriers foreign to the patent-granting country, and caution

suggests that both treaties deal with the subject so that no argument could ever be made that one treaty, by failing to deal with it, impliedly repealed a provision in an earlier treaty.

[7, 8] It does not quite appear to be argued that the defendants and their aircraft are not "of" foreign countries or national states within the potential scope of Section 272 and Articles 5ter and 27. The argument seems rather to be that the particular airlines involved, given the magnitude of their carrier operations between foreign countries and this country, are such that the airlines are comparable to American airlines in the extent of their use of the article of Cali's patent, and that, in consequence, the subtraction from the grant to Cali of the right to exclude others from the use of his patent is a very great subtraction and one hardly tolerable under the statutory and treaty language, which might be thought to deal only with relatively unimportant ("temporary" and "accidental") invasions of the patent right that are without commercial significance. That subtraction, although large, appears nevertheless plainly to be what the statutory and treaty immunities intend; substantiality in the subtractions of use from the exclusiveness of the grant of such patents as that to Cali, while not unreal, is within the treaty-making power. The foreign carriers' use is, in fact, not comparable to domestic airline use of the patent right; the sharply delimiting functional language greatly narrows the tolerated use.

[9, 10] It is suggested that a treaty diluting the exclusivity of the grant to Cali has to be regarded as, in essence, a governmental "taking." It is pointed out—and it is true—that once the United States has granted a patent under the existing patent law, it is itself required to pay tribute to the patentee if it uses the patent; as the govern-

ment, it can take by condemnation a license under the patent (in effect) if required for a public use. But plaintiff's argument is circular when used to equate an exercise of the treaty-making power, or of the power to amend the patent statute, as a "taking" of patents not granted until after the treaty has been made or the statute amended. It starts from the premise that the nation's enactment of a general statute authorizing the grant to patentees of the right to exclude others from the making, selling and using of an article or process, excludes the United States from reserving the power by treaty or law to create as it were royalty free licenses under future-granted patents to foreign carriers to the limited extent spelled out in Section 272, Article 5ter and Article 27. The argument, thus, assumes that the rights of all patentees generally are paramount to the government's legislative power and its power to grant treaty rights to international carriers under American patents. Whatever might have been the case as to patents granted before Brown v. Duchesne, it has not been the case as to patents granted since the expiration of the patents then extant. All such later patents have Brown v. Duchesne read into them. The patent to Cali was granted in 1966, after Section 272 had been passed and after Articles 5ter and 27 had been included in the two Conventions here directly involved. They were integral limitations on the grant. The enactment of the patent law under the constitutional provision simply was not a compact with all future inventors never to make such treaties as the Paris and Chicago Conventions and never to add a Section 272 to the patent laws. That is what Brown v. Duchesne decided in pointing out that the patent law must not be interpreted to abridge the nation's capacity to carry on its treaty-making

powers and its power to regulate foreign commerce.

It follows that plaintiff's motion for summary judgment in substance striking the defenses based on Section 272 and on Article 5ter of the Paris Convention and Article 27 of the Chicago Convention must be in all respects denied.

It is so ordered.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ANTHONY J. CALI,

Plaintiff,

-against-

JAPAN AIRLINES CO., LTD., et al.

Defendants.

Except for the possibility of sales in the United States of aircraft embodying the invention of the patent, the answers to the interrogatories do not appear to reach the point of the earlier decision. The "pool" question appears to evaporate with the responses to defendants' second interrogatories 8, 9, 10, 14, 15 and 16. Sales of aircraft embodying the invention of the patent might, if the patent is valid and infringed, have imposed a liability for a "royalty" on the sales value of the incorporated feature, but later use would be for account of the purchaser.

The motion for reconsideration must be denied. Whether that disposes of the case will evidently depend on whether the discovery and admission procedures satisfy counsel that there has been no use (or sale) not extraterritorial or embraced by the treaty and statute provisions referred to in the Memorandum and Order of

August 20, 1974, as interpreted in the Memorandum.

It is, accordingly,

Ordered that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration filed September 4, 1974, is denied.

Brooklyn, New York
November 6, 1974

s/
U.S.D.J.

JUDGMENT

(SAME TITLE)

An order of the Honorable John F. Dooling, Jr., United States District Judge, having been filed on February 4, 1975, directing the Clerk to enter judgment that plaintiff take nothing as against defendants Scandinavian Airlines System, Scandinavian Airlines System, Inc., and KLM Royal Dutch Airlines and dismissing the action as against such defendants and there being no just reason to delay entry of judgment, it is

ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the plaintiff take nothing as against defendants Scandinavian Airlines System, Scandinavian Airlines System, Inc., and KLM Royal Dutch Airlines and the action is dismissed as against such defendants.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
February 5, 1975

s/Lewis Orgel
Clerk

JUDGMENT

(SAME TITLE)

An order of the Honorable John F. Dooling, Jr., United States District Judge, having been filed on February 4, 1975, directing the Clerk to enter judgment that plaintiff take nothing as against defendant Japan Airlines Co., Ltd. and dismissing the action as against defendant Japan Airlines Co., Ltd. without prejudice to a later action based on any alleged infringements occurring after October 26, 1973, it is

ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the plaintiff take nothing as against defendant Japan Airlines Co., Ltd., and the action is dismissed as against Japan Airlines Co., Ltd. without prejudice to a later action based on any alleged infringements occurring after October 26, 1973.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
February 5, 1975

s/Lewis Orgel
Clerk

ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

United States Court of Appeals
For the Second Circuit

At a stated Term of the Untptates Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the United States Courthouse in the City of New York, on the eighth day of Decemb3r ocovcc and seventy-five.

Present: Hon. Irving R. Kaufman, Chief Judge; Hon. J. Joseph Smith; Hon. Thomas J. Meskill, **Circuit Judges,**

TITLE

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

This cause came on tohbe heard onhtlitv**liUnited States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

ON CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, it is now herebyd, and decreed that the judgments of said District Court be and they hereby are affirmed with costs to be taxed against the appellant.

A. DANIEL FUSARO
Clerk

by Vincent A. Carlin
Chief Deputy Clerk

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
APR 7 1976
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

No. 75-1269

October Term, 1975

ANTHONY J. CALI,

Petitioner,

v.

JAPAN AIRLINES CO., LTD., SCANDINAVIAN AIRLINES SYSTEM, SCANDINAVIAN AIRLINES SYSTEM, INC. and KLM ROYAL DUTCH AIRLINES,

Respondents.

RESPONDENTS' BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

DONALD E. DEGLING
Attorney for Respondents
Japan Airlines Co., Ltd. and
KLM Royal Dutch Airlines
277 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10017

Of Counsel,
RUSSELL J. BARRON

ROBERT R. GRAY
Attorney for Respondents
Scandinavian Airlines System and
Scandinavian Airlines System, Inc.
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Of Counsel,
LOUIS H. KURRELMEYER
ALAN D. SUGARMAN
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10017

April 7, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
OPINIONS BELOW	2
JURISDICTION	2
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	2
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, TREATIES AND STATUTES INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF CASE	3
REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT	4
1. The Decisions Of The Courts Below Were Correct	4
(a) Congress Is Not Required To Grant Exclusive Patent Rights	4
(b) Congress Did Not Intend The Patent Laws To Extend To Foreign Vessels Lawfully Entering The United States For Purposes Of Commerce	6
(c) The Treaties And Statute Immunizing The Use Of A Patented Invention On A Foreign Vessel Lawfully Entering The United States Are Valid Exercises Of Constitutional Powers	7
2. Cali Had An Adequate Remedy Under Foreign Patent Laws	10
CONCLUSION	10

APPENDICES

	PAGE
United States Constitution Article I, Section 8, Clause 8	1b
United States Constitution Article II, Section 2, Clause 2	1b
35 U. S. C. § 154	1b
35 U. S. C. § 272	1b
5 Stat. 117	2b
Paris Convention: Act of The Hague, 1925 Article 5ter	2b
Chicago Convention, 1944 Article 27	3b

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	PAGE
CASES	
Belknap v. *Schild*, 161 U. S. 10 (1896)	9
Brown v. *Duchesne*, 60 U. S. (19 How.) 183 (1857)	1, 6, 8, 9
Cammeyer v. *Newton*, 94 U. S. 225 (1876)	9
Cramp & Sons v. *Curtis Turbine Co.*, 246 U. S. 28 (1918)	9
Deepsouth Packing Co. v. *Laitram Corp.*, 406 U. S. 518 (1972)	10
Hollister v. *Benedict Manufacturing Co.*, 113 U. S. 59 (1885)	9
James v. *Campbell*, 104 U. S. 356 (1881)	9
McClurg et al. v. *Kingsland et al.*, 42 U. S. (1 How.) 202 (1843)	5
Radio Position Finding Corporation v. *Bendix Corporation*, 205 F. Supp. 850 (D. Md. 1962) affirmed *per curiam* 371 U. S. 577 (1963)	5
Richmond Co. v. *United States*, 275 U. S. 331 (1928)	9
United States v. *Palmer*, 128 U. S. 262 (1888)	9
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION	
Article I, Section 8, Clause 8	3, 6
Article II, Section 2, Clause 2	3
TREATIES	
Article 5ter, Paris Convention (1925)	1, 3, 7, 8, 9
Article 27, Chicago Convention (1944)	1, 3, 7, 8, 9
STATUTES	
35 U. S. C. § 154	3, 6
35 U. S. C. § 272	1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9
49 U. S. C. § 1301(19)	3 fn
49 U. S. C. § 1301(21)	4 fn
5 Stat. 117	3, 6

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

ANTHONY J. CALI,

Petitioner,

v.

JAPAN AIRLINES CO., LTD., SCANDINAVIAN AIRLINES SYSTEM, SCANDINAVIAN AIRLINES SYSTEM, INC. and KLM ROYAL DUTCH AIRLINES,

Respondents.

RESPONDENTS' BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

There is no issue in this patent case which warrants review by this Court.

First, the District Court and the Court of Appeals properly held that the patent in suit was not infringed by the lawful entrance into the United States of respondent foreign airlines' aircraft equipped with the accused jet engines, for four reasons: (1) The accused use does not constitute infringement under the Patent Law (35 U.S.C. § 272)*; (2) The accused use does not constitute infringement by virtue of Article 5ter of the Paris Convention (as revised in 1925)**; (3) The accused use does not constitute infringement under Article 27 of the Chicago Convention of 1944***; and (4) The accused use is not an infringement because it is not within the grant of a United States patent under the doctrine of *Brown* v. *Duchesne,* 60 U. S. (19 How.) 183 (1857).

---

* Reprinted at Appendix, page 1b.

** *Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property,* January 4, 1962 [1962] 1 U. S. T. 1, T. I. A. S. No. 4961. The text of Article 5ter is reprinted at Appendix, page 2b.

*** *Convention on International Civil Aviation,* December 7, 1944, 61 Stat. 1180 (1947), T. I. A. S. No. 1591. The text of Article 27 is reprinted at Appendix, page 3b.

Second, the Petition cannot rely on any of the reasons set forth in this Court's Rule 19: there is here no unsettled question of federal law; there is here no conflict with the decision of another Court of Appeals; there is here no conflict with decisions of this Court; there has been no departure from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings. Moreover, there is here no special or important reason why the Writ prayed for should be granted.

Opinions Below

The Opinion of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York is reported at 380 F.Supp. 1120 and is reprinted in Petitioner's Appendix at pages 1a through 19a. The unreported memorandum and order denying Petitioner's motion for reconsideration is printed in Petitioner's Appendix at pages 20a through 21a. The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the judgments of the District Court (Petitioner's Appendix, pages 22a through 23a) in an unreported *per curiam* order which is printed in Petitioner's Appendix at page 24a.

Jurisdiction

The jurisdictional requisites are sufficiently set forth in the Petition.

Questions Presented

Petitioner's statement of the questions presented is argumentative and begs the precise issues presented, which Respondents submit are more accurately stated as follows:

1. Were not both Courts below correct in holding that Congress is not required by the Constitution to cause the patent laws to extend to foreign aircraft lawfully entering the United States for purposes of commerce and has not done so?

2. Were not both Courts below correct in holding that Congress and the President acted within their constitutional powers in enacting Section 272 of the Patent Act of July 1952 and in

making Article 5ter of the Paris Convention (The Hague Revision 1925) and Article 27 of the Chicago Convention (1944), all of which provide immunity against claims for patent infringement against mechanisms used in foreign aircraft which make temporary or authorized entries into the United States, at least as to patents subsequently issued?

Constitutional Provisions, Treaties and Statutes Involved

The questions presented involve the patent clause of the Constitution (Article I, Section 8, Clause 8) and the treaty making power of the Constitution (Article II, Section 2, Clause 2), both reprinted at Appendix, page 1b.

The questions presented also involve Sections 154 and 272 of the Patent Act of July 19, 1952 (35 U. S. C. §§ 154 and 272), reprinted at Appendix, page 1b, and the predecessor of Section 154 which was Section 5 of the Patent Act of 1836 (5 Stat. 117), reprinted at Appendix, page 2b.

Finally, the questions presented involve Article 5ter of the Paris Convention (The Hague Revision 1925), reprinted at Appendix, page 2b, and Article 27 of the Chicago Convention (1944), reprinted at Appendix, page 3b.

Statement of Case

Petitioner, Anthony J. Cali ("Cali"), seeks review of a judgment affirming the dismissal of his complaint against Japan Airlines Co., Ltd. ("JAL"), KLM Royal Dutch Airlines ("KLM"), Scandinavian Airlines System ("SAS") and Scandinavian Airlines System, Inc. ("SAS, Inc.") for the alleged infringement of Cali's U. S. Patent No. 3,265,290, issued August 9, 1966. JAL, KLM and SAS are, and at all relevant times were, "foreign air carriers"* holding permits issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board. SAS, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of SAS, is a New York corporation which does not own or operate aircraft or aircraft

---

* See 49 U. S. C. § 1301(19).

engines. The Cali patent relates to a modification of certain jet engines which powered aircraft of the Respondents.

The claim for alleged infringement is based solely on the foreign airline respondents' operation of aircraft equipped with the allegedly infringing jet engines in regular service between points outside the United States and a point in the United States. Cali does not claim that any of the Respondents ever made or sold engines incorporating the alleged invention within the United States at any time relevant here, or used such engines in "interstate or overseas air transportation".*

The defenses of immunity based upon the treaties, statute and decisional law were sustained on a motion for summary judgment brought by Cali.

Reasons for Denying the Writ

1. The Decisions Of The Courts Below Were Correct

(a) *Congress Is Not Required To Grant Exclusive Patent Rights*

The patent clause of the Constitution gives Congress the power to enact patent laws but—contrary to Cali's argument—does not command that only "exclusive" rights may be granted. The District Court stated the principle succinctly as follows:

> "The constitutional provision is not self-executing. It empowers but does not command the Congress to grant patent rights, and the source of any specific patent right is the statute which defines the nature and extent of the patent right granted. See *Deepsouth Packing Co.* v. *Laitram Corp.*, 1972, 406 U. S. 518, 525-526, 92 S. Ct. 1700, 32 L. Ed. 2d 273. In *Mast, Foos & Co.* v. *Stover Mfg. Co.*, 1900, 177 U. S. 485, 494, 20 S. Ct. 708, 712, 44 L. Ed. 856, the court observed sharply
>
> 'Congress having created the monopoly, may put such limitations upon it as it pleases.'" (Petitioner's Appendix, page 10a)

* See 49 U. S. C. § 1301(21).

The District Court's statement is consistent with this Court's views in *McClurg et al.* v. *Kingsland et al.*, 42 U. S. (1 How.) 202, 206 (1843):

> "[T]he powers of Congress to legislate upon the subject of patents is plenary by the terms of the Constitution, and as there are no restraints on its exercise, there can be no limitation of their right to modify them at their pleasure, so that they do not take away the rights of property in *existing* patents." (Emphasis added)

More recently, the constitutionality of a private patent law which granted less than exclusive rights was upheld in *Radio Position Finding Corporation* v. *Bendix Corporation*, 205 F. Supp. 850 (D. Md. 1962) affirmed *per curiam*, 371 U. S. 577 (1963)*. In that case, a three-judge district court rejected a defense to a claim for patent infringement that the patent, issued pursuant to a private law, was invalid because "it does not grant an 'exclusive right' within the meaning of Article 1, § 8, Clause 8 of the Constitution" and held:

> "The direct and indirect expressions of approval of various private laws which have modified the exclusiveness of the grant to the patentee and the long legislative history of the exercise of congressional power to modify the exclusiveness of a patent grant, dating, indeed, from shortly after the adoption of the Constitution, lead us to conclude that Congress did not violate Article 1, § 8, cl. 8 of the Constitution in the enactment of Private Law 1008." 250 F. Supp. at 855.

Thus, the sole premise of Cali's argument is false—Congress does have power to grant an inventor less than exclusive rights.

* Cali has sought to distinguish the *Bendix* case on the erroneous ground that it related to an "extension" patent. In fact, Private Law 1008 merely relieved the patentee from the effect of a statutory bar which otherwise would have prevented the granting of his original patent.

(b) *Congress Did Not Intend The Patent Laws To Extend To Foreign Vessels Lawfully Entering The United States For Purposes Of Commerce*

Since the earliest days of the nation, Congress has, in varying forms, exercised the patent power granted to it by Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 of the Constitution (Appendix, page 1b). At present, Section 154 of the Patent Act of 1952 (35 U. S. C. § 154) (Appendix, page 1b) grants to a patentee "the right to exclude others from . . . using . . . the invention throughout the United States . . . ." This provision has remained substantially unchanged since 1870. Prior to 1870, however, the patent act provided a seemingly broader grant to the applicant of "the full and exclusive right and liberty of . . . using . . . the said invention. . . ." (Section 5 of the Patent Act of 1836, 5 Stat. 117, Appendix, page 2b).

The precise question here presented, i.e. the reach of the patent laws, was before the Court in *Brown* v. *Duchesne,* 60 U. S. (19 How.) 183 (1857), with respect to a patent issued under the 1836 Patent Act. The Court held:

> "But we must interpret our patent laws with reference to our own Constitution and laws and judicial decisions. And the court are of opinion that the rights of property and exclusive use granted to a patentee does not extend to a foreign vessel lawfully entering one of our ports; and that the use of such improvement, in the construction, fitting out, or equipment of such vessel, while she is coming into or going out of a port of the United States, is not an infringement of the rights of an American patentee, provided it was placed upon her in a foreign port, and authorized by the laws of the country to which she belongs." 60 U. S. at 198-199.

Cali asserts here, as he did in the lower courts, that the *Brown* decision turned on a " 'trifling' damage aspect . . . a prerequisite of the *Brown* rationale, which distinguishes it from the 'great subtraction' of the patentee's rights which is presented here" (Petition, page 6). The contention that *Brown* is a *de minimus* case is laid to rest in the ensuing portion of the Court's opinion:

> "But it seems to be supposed, that this user of the improvement was, by legal intendment, a trespass upon the rights of the plaintiff; and that although no real damage was sustained by the plaintiff, and no profit or advantage gained by the defendant, the law presumes a damage, and that the action may be maintained on that ground. In other words, that there is a technical damage, in the eye of the law, although none has really been sustained.
>
> "This view of the subject, however, presupposes that the patent laws embrace improvements on foreign ships, lawfully made in their own country, which have been patented here. But that is the question in controversy. And the court is of opinion that cases of that kind were not in the contemplation of Congress in enacting the patent laws, and cannot, upon any sound construction, be regarded as embraced in them." 60 U. S. at 196-197.

(c) *The Treaties And Statute Immunizing The Use Of A Patented Invention On A Foreign Vessel Lawfully Entering The United States Are Valid Exercises Of Constitutional Powers*

Both courts below upheld and applied: *Article 5ter of the Paris Convention,* which exempts from infringement the use of a patented invention by foreign vessels or vehicles which enter the United States temporarily or accidentally (Appendix, page 2b); *Article 27 of the Chicago Convention,* which provides a similar exemption for use of a patented invention by foreign aircraft making an authorized entry into the United States (Appendix, page 3b); and *Section 272 of the Patent Law of 1952,* which also exempts from infringement the use of a patented invention by foreign vessels and vehicles which temporarily or accidentally enter the United States (Appendix, page 1b).

The Paris Convention, as a whole, is directed broadly to international industrial property rights; the Chicago Convention is concerned generally with international air navigation; and Section 272 is a part of the internal United States patent law.

On the issue here involved the District Court properly observed that these three enactments intersect but are not identical (Petitioner's Appendix, pages 16a through 17a). The District Court also found that the three enactments are consistent with one another and with this Court's decision in *Brown* v. *Duchesne*. Not only are these enactments consistent, the *Brown* decision itself presaged Article 5ter of the Paris Convention when the Court stated:

> "The construction claimed by the plaintiff would confer on patentees not only rights of property, but also political power, and enable them to embarrass the treaty-making power in its negotiations with foreign nations, and also to interfere with the legislation of Congress when exercising its constitutional power to regulate commerce. And if a treaty should be negotiated with a foreign nation, by which the vessels of each party were to be freely admitted into the ports of the other, upon equal terms with its own, upon the payment of the ordinary port charges, and the foreign Government faithfully carried it into execution, yet the Government of the United States would find itself unable to fulfill its obligations if the foreign ship had about her, in her construction or equipment, anything for which a patent had been granted." 60 U. S. at 197.

Further, the legislative history of Section 272 demonstrates that it was merely intended to codify the *Brown* case and Article 5ter of the Paris Convention:

> "This section follows the requirement of the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, to which the United States is a party, and also codifies the holding of the Supreme Court that use of the patented invention on board a foreign ship does not infringe a patent."*

Finally, subsection (c) of Article 27 of the Chicago Convention (Appendix, page 3b) specifically refers to the Paris

---

* H. R. Rep. No. 1923, 82d Cong., 2d Sess. 28 (1952); S. Rep. No. 1979, 82d Cong., 2d Sess. 28 (1952), reproduced in 1952 U. S. Code Cong. and Ad. News 2394, 2422.

Convention and generally refers to legislation throughout the world similar in effect to Section 272.

Respondents submit that this Court's decision in *Brown* v. *Duchesne, supra,* establishes that Article 5ter of the Paris Convention and Article 27 of the Chicago Convention are valid exercises of the treaty making power of Congress and the President and that Section 272 is a valid exercise of the patent power by Congress.

Cali argues that the treaties and statute here in issue are an unconstitutional "taking" of rights granted by his patent. In support, Cali cites a line of cases to the effect that once the United States has granted a patent, it is itself required to pay tribute to the patentee if it uses the patent: *Cammeyer* v. *Newton,* 94 U. S. 225 (1876); *James* v. *Campbell,* 104 U. S. 356 (1881); *Hollister* v. *Benedict Manufacturing Co.,* 113 U. S. 59 (1885); *United States* v. *Palmer,* 128 U. S. 262 (1888); *Belknap* v. *Schild,* 161 U. S. 10 (1896); *Cramp & Sons* v. *Curtis Turbine Co.,* 246 U. S. 28 (1918); and *Richmond Co.* v. *United States,* 275 U. S. 331 (1928).

This is a specious argument. As early as 1857 this Court held in *Brown* v. *Duchesne* that a United States patent did not extend to foreign vessels lawfully in the United States for purposes of commerce. Article 5ter of the Paris Convention has been the law of the land since 1925, and Article 27 of the Chicago Convention has been the law of the land since 1944. Section 272 of the Patent Law has been in effect since 1952. The grant of Cali's patent in 1966 never extended to the use here accused and, accordingly, there has been no "taking" of any patent right from Cali.

2. Cali Had An Adequate Remedy Under Foreign Patent Laws

As shown above, Cali's claim was denied because the grant of his United States patent does not extend to foreign vessels which lawfully enter the United States for purposes of commerce. Admittedly, the Paris Convention, the Chicago Convention and the patent laws of the United States, Japan, The Netherlands, Denmark, Norway and Sweden gave Cali the right to seek patents which would have comprehended the claims for infringement asserted here. This Court stated in *Deepsouth Packing Co.* v. *Laitram Corp.*, 406 U.S. 518, 531 (1972):

> "To the degree that the inventor needs protection in markets other than those of this country, the wording of 35 U.S.C. §§ 154 and 271 reveals a congressional intent to have him seek it abroad through patents secured in countries where his goods are being used."

Cali's failure to pursue the remedy provided by Congress warrants denial of the Writ.

CONCLUSION

The Petition should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

DONALD E. DEGLING
Attorney for Respondents
Japan Airlines Co., Ltd. and
KLM Royal Dutch Airlines
277 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10017

Of Counsel,
RUSSELL J. BARRON

ROBERT R. GRAY
Attorney for Respondents
Scandinavian Airlines System and
Scandinavian Airlines System, Inc.
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Of Counsel,
LOUIS H. KURRELMEYER
ALAN D. SUGARMAN
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10017

April 7, 1976

APPENDICES

	PAGE
United States Constitution Article I, Section 8, Clause 8	1b
United States Constitution Article II, Section 2, Clause 2	1b
35 U. S. C. § 154	1b
35 U. S. C. § 272	1b
5 Stat. 117	2b
Paris Convention: Act of The Hague, 1925 Article 5ter	2b
Chicago Convention, 1944 Article 27	3b

CONSTITUTION

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8

The Congress shall have Power . . .

* * *

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries; * * *

Article II, Section 2, Clause 2

[The President] shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; * * *

35 U.S.C. § 154

CONTENTS AND TERM OF PATENT

Every patent shall contain a short title of the invention and a grant to the patentee, his heirs or assigns, for the term of seventeen years, subject to the payment of issue fees as provided for in this title, of the right to exclude others from making, using, or selling the invention throughout the United States, referring to the specification for the particulars thereof. A copy of the specification and drawings shall be annexed to the patent and be a part thereof. As amended July 24, 1965, Pub. L. 89-83 § 5, 79 Stat. 261.

35 U.S.C. § 272

TEMPORARY PRESENCE IN THE UNITED STATES

The use of any invention in any vessel, aircraft or vehicle of any country which affords similar privileges to vessels, aircraft or vehicles of the United States, entering the United States temporarily or accidentally, shall not constitute infringement of any patent, if the invention is used exclusively for the needs of the vessel, aircraft or vehicle and is not sold in or used for the manufacture of anything to be sold in or exported from the United States.

5 Stat. 117

Sec. 5. And be it further enacted, That all patents issued from said office shall be issued in the name of the United States and under the seal of said office, and be signed by the Secretary of State, and countersigned by the Commissioner of the said office, and shall be recorded, together with the descriptions, specifications, and drawings, in the said office, in books to be kept for that purpose. Every such patent shall contain a short description or title of the invention or discovery, correctly indicating its nature and design, and in its terms grant to the applicant or applicants, his or their heirs, administrators, executors, or assigns, for a term not exceeding fourteen years, the full and exclusive right and liberty of making, using, and vending to others to be used, the said invention or discovery, referring to the specifications for the particulars thereof, a copy of which shall be annexed to the patent, specifying what the patentee claims as his invention or discovery.

Paris Convention: Act of The Hague, 1925

Article 5ter

In each of the countries of the Union the following shall not be considered as infringements of the rights of a patentee:

1. the use on board vessels of other countries of the Union of devices forming the subject of his patent in the body of the vessel, in the machinery, tackle, gear and other accessories, when such vessels temporarily or accidentally enter the waters of a country, provided that such devices are used there exclusively for the needs of the vessel;

2. the use of devices forming the subject of the patent in the construction or operation of aircraft or land vehicles of other countries of the Union, or of accessories to such aircraft or land vehicles, when those aircraft or land vehicles temporarily or accidentally enter the country.

Chicago Convention, 1944

Article 27

(a) While engaged in international air navigation, any authorized entry of aircraft of a contracting State into the territory of another contracting State or authorized transit across the territory of such State with or without landings shall not entail any seizure or detention of the aircraft or any claim against the owner or operator thereof or any other interference therewith by or on behalf of such State or any person therein, on the ground that the construction, mechanism, parts, accessories or operation of the aircraft is an infringement of any patent, design, or model duly granted or registered in the State whose territory is entered by the aircraft, it being agreed that no deposit of security in connection with the foregoing exemption from seizure or detention of the aircraft shall in any case be required in the State entered by such aircraft.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (a) of this Article shall also be applicable to the storage of spare parts and spare equipment for the aircraft and the right to use and install the same in the repair of an aircraft of a contracting State in the territory of any other contracting State, provided that any patented part or equipment so stored shall not be sold or distributed internally in or exported commercially from the contracting State entered by the aircraft.

(c) The benefits of this Article shall apply only to such States, parties to this Convention, as either (1) are parties to the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property and to any amendments thereof; or (2) have enacted patent laws which recognize and give adequate protection to inventions made by the nationals of the other States parties to this Convention.